



## **Texas Department of Insurance**

### **Division of Workers' Compensation**

Medical Fee Dispute Resolution, MS-48

7551 Metro Center Drive, Suite 100 • Austin, Texas 78744-1645

518-804-4000 telephone • 512-804-4811 fax • [www.tdi.texas.gov](http://www.tdi.texas.gov)

## **MEDICAL FEE DISPUTE RESOLUTION FINDINGS AND DECISION**

### **GENERAL INFORMATION**

#### **Requestor Name and Address**

RENAISSANCE HOSPITAL  
C/O BURTON & HYDE PLLC  
PO BOX 684749  
AUSTIN TX 78768-4749

#### **Respondent Name**

AMERICAN CASUALTY CO OF READING PA

#### **Carrier's Austin Representative Box**

Box Number 47

#### **MFDR Tracking Number**

M4-06-0835-01

### **REQUESTOR'S POSITION SUMMARY**

**Requestor's Position Summary:** "Carrier did not pay usual and customary. Hospital requests to be reimbursed at usual and customary. Carrier denied Request for Reconsideration."

**Amount in Dispute:** \$6,134.33

### **RESPONDENT'S POSITION SUMMARY**

**Respondent's Position Summary:** The respondent did not submit a position statement for consideration in this medical fee dispute.

### **SUMMARY OF FINDINGS**

Dates of Service	Disputed Services	Amount In Dispute	Amount Due
April 27, 2005	Outpatient Services	\$6,134.33	\$0.00

### **FINDINGS AND DECISION**

This medical fee dispute is decided pursuant to Texas Labor Code §413.031 and all applicable, adopted rules of the Texas Department of Insurance, Division of Workers' Compensation.

#### **Background**

1. 28 Texas Administrative Code §133.307 sets out the procedures for resolving medical fee disputes
2. 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.1 provides for fair and reasonable reimbursement of services not identified in an established fee guideline.
3. Texas Labor Code §413.011(d) requires that fee guidelines must be fair and reasonable and designed to ensure the quality of medical care and to achieve effective medical cost control. The guidelines may not provide for payment of a fee in excess of the fee charged for similar treatment of an injured individual of an equivalent standard of living and paid by that individual or by someone acting on that individual's behalf. It further requires that the Division consider the increased security of payment afforded by the Act in

establishing the fee guidelines.

4. This request for medical fee dispute resolution was received by the Division on September 6, 2005. Pursuant to 28 Texas Administrative Code §133.307(g)(3), effective January 1, 2003, 27 *Texas Register* 12282, applicable to disputes filed on or after January 1, 2003, the Division notified the requestor on October 3, 2005 to send additional documentation relevant to the fee dispute as set forth in the rule.
5. U.S. Bankruptcy Judge Michael Lynn issued a “STIPULATION AND ORDER GRANTING RELIEF FROM AUTOMATIC STAY TO PERMIT CONTINUANCE AND ADJUDICATION OF DISPUTED WORKERS COMPENSATION CLAIMS BEFORE THE TEXAS STATE OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS,” dated August 27, 2010, in the case of *In re: Renaissance Hospital – Grand Prairie, Inc. d/b/a/ Renaissance Hospital – Grand Prairie, et al.*, in the United States Bankruptcy Court for the Northern District of Texas, Fort Worth Division in Case No. 08-43775-7. The order lifted the automatic stay to allow continuance of the claim adjudication process as to the workers’ compensation receivables before SOAH, effective October 1, 2010. The order specified John Dee Spicer as the Chapter 7 trustee of the debtor’s estate. By letter dated October 5, 2010, Mr. Spicer provided express written authorization for Cass Burton of the law office of Burton & Hyde, PLLC, PO Box 684749, Austin, Texas 78768-4749, to be the point of contact on Mr. Spicer’s behalf relating to matters between and among the debtors and the Division concerning medical fee disputes. The Division will utilize this address in all communications with the requestor regarding this medical fee dispute.
6. The services in dispute were reduced/denied by the respondent with the following reason codes:
  - \*M – The recommended payments above reflect a fair. Reasonable and consistent methodology or reimbursement pursuant to the criteria set forth in
  - W9 – Unnecessary medical treatment base on the peer review

## **Findings**

1. In response to a request for reconsideration, the insurance carrier denied disputed services with reason code W9 – “Unnecessary medical treatment base on the peer review.” The requestor presented some information to indicate that the services were pre-authorized under authorization code 1435667. Former 28 Texas Administrative Code §133.301, effective July 15, 2000, Volume 25 *Texas Register*, page 2115, states, in pertinent part, that “The insurance carrier shall not retrospectively review the medical necessity of a medical bill for treatment(s) and/or service(s) for which the health care provider has obtained preauthorization...” In response to a request from the Division for additional information, the respondent sent an e-mail to the Division, dated September 26, 2005, stating that “Regarding the billing for Renaissance Hospital for [the injured worker] dos 4-27-05 we do not have a medical necessity issue on this bill. The Division therefore concludes that this denial reason code is not supported and there are no unresolved issues of medical necessity relating to the services in dispute. These services will therefore be reviewed per applicable Division rules and fee guidelines.
2. This dispute relates to outpatient services performed in a hospital setting with reimbursement subject to the provisions of 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.1, effective May 16, 2002, Volume 27 *Texas Register*, page 4047, which requires that “Reimbursement for services not identified in an established fee guideline shall be reimbursed at fair and reasonable rates as described in the Texas Workers’ Compensation Act, §413.011 until such period that specific fee guidelines are established by the commission.”
3. 28 Texas Administrative Code §133.307(g)(3)(C)(iv), effective January 1, 2003, 27 *Texas Register* 12282, applicable to disputes filed on or after January 1, 2003, requires the requestor to send additional documentation relevant to the fee dispute including a statement of the disputed issue(s) that shall include “how the submitted documentation supports the requestor position for each disputed fee issue.” Review of the submitted documentation finds that the requestor did not state how the submitted documentation supports the requestor’s position for each disputed fee issue. The Division concludes that the requestor has not met the requirements of §133.307(g)(3)(C)(iv).
4. 28 Texas Administrative Code §133.307(g)(3)(D), effective January 1, 2003, 27 *Texas Register* 12282, applicable to disputes filed on or after January 1, 2003, requires the requestor to provide “documentation that discusses, demonstrates, and justifies that the payment amount being sought is a fair and reasonable rate of reimbursement.” Review of the submitted documentation finds that:
  - The requestor did not submit a position statement for consideration in this dispute.
  - The requestor’s rationale for increased reimbursement from the *Table of Disputed Services* states that “Carrier did not pay usual and customary. Hospital requests to be reimbursed at usual and customary. Carrier denied Request for Reconsideration.”
  - The Division has previously found that “hospital charges are not a valid indicator of a hospital’s costs of providing services nor of what is being paid by other payors,” as stated in the adoption preamble to the Division’s former *Acute Care Inpatient Hospital Fee Guideline*, 22 *Texas Register* 6276. It further states that “Alternative methods of reimbursement were considered... and rejected because they use hospital charges as their basis and allow the hospitals to affect their reimbursement by inflating their charges...” Volume 22

*Texas Register*, pages 6268-6269. Therefore, the use of a hospital's "usual and customary" charges cannot be favorably considered when no other data or documentation was submitted to support that the payment amount being sought is a fair and reasonable reimbursement for the services in dispute.

- The requestor did not explain how payment of its usual and customary charges would result in a fair and reasonable reimbursement for the services in dispute.
- The requestor did not submit documentation to support that payment in the amount of its usual and customary charges would result in a fair and reasonable reimbursement for the services in dispute.
- The request for reconsideration letter to the insurance carrier states that the requestor "...relies upon a portion of the Adopted Medical Fee Guidelines 1996..." adopted by reference in former Division rule at 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.201, Volume 21 *Texas Register* page 2361. However, the 1996 Medical Fee Guideline is not applicable to the services in dispute, as indicated in former Division rule at 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(a)(4), effective August 1, 1997, Volume 22 *Texas Register* page 6264, which states that "Ambulatory/outpatient surgical care is not covered by this guideline and shall be reimbursed at a fair and reasonable rate until the issuance of a fee guideline addressing these specific types of reimbursements." 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.1 is the applicable rule for determining reimbursement for the services in this dispute.
- In support of the requested reimbursement, the requestor submitted redacted explanations of benefits, and selected portions of EOBs, from various sample insurance carriers. However, the requestor did not discuss or explain how the sample EOBs support the requestor's position that additional payment is due. Review of the submitted documentation finds that the requestor did not establish that the sample EOBs are for services that are substantially similar to the services in dispute. The carriers' reimbursement methodologies are not described on the EOBs. Nor did the requestor explain or discuss the sample carriers' methodologies or how the payment amount was determined for each sample EOB. The requestor did not discuss whether such payment was typical for such services or for the services in dispute.
- The requestor has not supported that payment of the requested amount would satisfy the requirements of Division rule at 28 TAC §134.1.

The request for additional reimbursement is not supported. Thorough review of the documentation submitted by the requestor finds that the requestor has not demonstrated or justified that payment of the amount sought would be a fair and reasonable rate of reimbursement for the services in dispute. Additional payment cannot be recommended.

### **Conclusion**

The Division would like to emphasize that individual medical fee dispute outcomes rely upon the evidence presented by the requestor and respondent during dispute resolution, and the thorough review and consideration of that evidence. After thorough review and consideration of all the evidence presented by the parties to this dispute, it is determined that the submitted documentation does not support the reimbursement amounts sought by the requestor. The Division concludes that this dispute was not filed in the form and manner prescribed under Division rule at 28 Texas Administrative Code §133.307. The Division further concludes that the requestor failed to support its position that additional reimbursement is due. As a result, the amount ordered is \$0.00.

### **ORDER**

Based upon the documentation submitted by the parties and in accordance with the provisions of Texas Labor Code §413.031, the Division has determined that the requestor is not entitled to additional reimbursement for the services involved in this dispute.

### **Authorized Signature**

_____	<u>Grayson Richardson</u>	<u>May 24, 2012</u>
Signature	Medical Fee Dispute Resolution Officer	Date

### **YOUR RIGHT TO REQUEST AN APPEAL**

Either party to this medical fee dispute has a right to request an appeal. A request for hearing must be in writing and it must be received by the DWC Chief Clerk of Proceedings within **twenty** days of your receipt of this decision. A request for hearing should be sent to: Chief Clerk of Proceedings, Texas Department of Insurance, Division of Workers Compensation, P.O. Box 17787, Austin, Texas, 78744. The party seeking review of the MDR decision shall deliver a copy of the request for a hearing to all other parties involved in the dispute at the same time the

request is filed with the Division. **Please include a copy of the *Medical Fee Dispute Resolution Findings and Decision*** together with any other required information specified in 28 Texas Administrative Code §148.3(c), including a **certificate of service demonstrating that the request has been sent to the other party**.

**Si prefiere hablar con una persona en español acerca de ésta correspondencia, favor de llamar a 512-804-4812.**